

Vol. 11
1955

PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES, 1956

by

Buel W. Patch

	PAGE
RIVALRY FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATIONS	831
Competition in Both Parties for 1956 Honors	831
Eisenhower's Plans and Presidential Primaries	832
POTENTIAL CANDIDATES AMONG REPUBLICANS	833
Front-Runner Nixon: Strong Points and Handicaps	834
Nixon's Votes in Congress; Use of Anti-Red Issue	835
Chief Justice Warren: Popular But Not Receptive	836
Senator Knowland of Republican Party's Right Wing	840
Variety of Favorite-Son or Dark-Horse Possibilities	841
CANDIDATES FOR DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION	842
Political Aspects of Stevenson's New Candidacy	843
Stevenson's Position on Important Current Issues	845
Political Views and New Deal Service of Harriman	846
Senator Kefauver: Primary Vote-Getter and Liberal	849
Latent Southern Support for a Dark-Horse Candidate	850

No. 21
Nov. 30

THE right to reproduce material contained in *Editorial Research Reports* is strictly reserved to the newspaper clients of the service. Verbatim use of such material by others will be permitted only upon written authorization of the editor.

RICHARD M. BOECKEL, *Editor*

Editorial Research Reports
1205 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington

PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES, 1956

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S resumption at Gettysburg of a progressively increasing share of the duties of his office has given Republican party leaders renewed hope of prevailing upon him to run again in 1956. However, current indications that Eisenhower soon will be able to take full charge at the White House, and fill out his present term in active command, do not necessarily foreshadow willingness to carry the heavy burdens of the presidency for four additional years.

The President's heart attack on Sept. 24 completely altered the picture of next year's presidential election contest as it then existed. Only two weeks earlier, at a Denver breakfast meeting of Republican state chairmen, Eisenhower had warned that "humans are frail" and had cautioned against pinning on one man all hopes for party success in the 1956 campaign. But until the Chief Executive became ill, G.O.P. leaders confidently expected him to head the Republican ticket again. And despite Democratic assertions to the contrary, it was widely assumed that the voters would give Ike another term.

COMPETITION IN BOTH PARTIES FOR 1956 HONORS

Although the President has been making gratifying progress toward full recovery, many observers still consider that he is unlikely to be a candidate next year. If that proves to be the case, the Democrats probably will have as good a chance as the Republicans to capture the White House. The Democratic party's 1956 nomination thus has begun to look like a prize instead of a duty, and competition has been building up for the party honors that formerly only Adlai Stevenson seemed prepared to accept. Republican aspirants have been hesitant to disclose their ambitions, in the absence of definite word that Eisenhower will not run, but there has been no lack of speculation and discussion about presidential possibilities in the G.O.P.

Editorial Research Reports

The President's prestige within the Republican party is so great that the national convention no doubt would nominate the man of his choice if he cared to express a preference. Theodore Roosevelt had no difficulty in bringing about the nomination of William Howard Taft in 1908, and Eisenhower presumably could exert his influence in the same way. The weight of opinion, however, is that it would not be characteristic of Eisenhower to seek to impose his will on the convention delegates. Some persons think he might list perhaps half a dozen individuals, any one of whom he would be glad to see nominated. Others count on him to keep hands off entirely and leave it to the individual candidates to show what they can do without his blessing.

EISENHOWER'S PLANS AND PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

A free-for-all competition among Republican candidates cannot open in earnest, however, until President Eisenhower in effect gives the word by ruling himself out. Latest medical reports indicate that it will be late January or early February before the doctors can say with assurance whether the President's recovery will be complete. But if Eisenhower in the meantime makes up his mind not to run again under any circumstances, a statement to that effect may be forthcoming as soon as the decision is reached.

Presidential primary requirements supply a practical reason for making Eisenhower's intentions known early in the new year. Although the New Hampshire primary, first of those scheduled in a score of states,¹ will not be held until Mar. 13, petitions on behalf of presidential candidates entering the primary must be filed between Jan. 13 and Feb. 2. Petitions may be filed in New Hampshire without the consent of the candidate, but the candidate's consent is required in some other presidential primary states. For Ohio's May 8 primary, moreover, the deadline for petitions falls as early as Feb. 8; in the case of Wisconsin the presidential candidate's consent does not have to be filed until Mar. 2, but nomination papers for convention delegates committed to particular presidential candidates may be put in circulation as early as Jan. 2.

¹ Presidential primaries of one type or another are to be held in 1956 on the following dates in the states or districts indicated: Mar. 13, New Hampshire; Mar. 20, Minnesota; Apr. 3, Wisconsin; Apr. 10, Illinois; Apr. 17, New Jersey; Apr. 24, Alaska, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania; May 1, Alabama (Democratic only) and District of Columbia; May 7, Maryland; May 8, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia; May 15, Nebraska; May 18, Oregon; May 29, Florida; June 5, California, Montana, New York, South Dakota. See "Presidential Primaries, 1952," *E.R.R.*, Vol. 1 1952, pp. 43-59.

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

If Eisenhower is not going to run again, an early statement to that effect obviously would be helpful to those Republican hopefuls who would like to make aggressive primary campaigns but who will not feel free to take the initiative until the President's plans are clarified. Sen. Knowland of California, Republican Senate leader and himself a likely presidential candidate, said on Nov. 8 that the President "will have to make an early announcement of his plans." Knowland added: "There must be time for the country, the Republican party, primaries and conventions to decide on his alternate if he decides not to run."

Potential Candidates Among Republicans

REPUBLICAN DELEGATES chosen at state primaries or conventions next year will assemble at San Francisco on Aug. 20 for the first Republican national convention ever held on the Pacific coast.² Selection of a California city as the convention site constituted recognition of the growing political importance of that state, just as selection of a Californian for the Republican vice presidential nomination did four years ago. Population increases and party apportionment rules have swelled the California delegation in the Republican convention from 44 members in 1940 and 53 in 1948 to 70 members in 1952 and 1956. California and Pennsylvania, each with 70 delegates, now are outranked only by New York with 96 delegates.³

When the Republican National Committee decided to hold the 1956 convention at San Francisco, renomination of Eisenhower and Nixon was taken largely for granted. Now that the presidential nomination may be open to contest, the host state, in keeping with its mounting political prominence, promises to produce more candidates for the honor than any other state. No fewer than four Californians are being mentioned as possibilities for the nomination: Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Sen. William F. Knowland—representing all three branches of the federal government—and Gov. Goodwin J. Knight.

² The Democrats met at San Francisco in 1920, when it took 44 ballots to settle the three-cornered McAdoo-Palmer-Cox contest. See "Open Conventions," *E.R.R.*, Vol. I 1952, p. 369.

³ The San Francisco convention will have a total of at least 1,300 delegates, as against 1,206 in 1952. Award of additional seats to states which went over to the Republican column in 1952 accounts for the increase.

Editorial Research Reports

FRONT-RUNNER NIXON: STRONG POINTS AND HANDICAPS

Nixon today is unquestionably the front-runner, not only among the Californians, but among all the men whose names have been brought up so far as possible candidates for Republican standard-bearer if President Eisenhower does not run. The Vice President led the field in a recent Gallup poll on preferences for the Republican nomination.⁴ His high position in the administration, the marks of confidence in him shown by the President, and his intimate knowledge of Cabinet and National Security Council deliberations can be said to make Nixon a logical choice as candidate to succeed his chief and carry on the Eisenhower policies and programs. In addition, he is an effective political campaigner and would be expected to keep California's 32 electoral votes on the Republican side.⁵

Certain other factors, however, might stand in the way of Nixon's nomination. It is no secret that the Vice President's fellow-Californians, Knowland and Knight, are not among his partisans. The governor said on Oct. 23 that he expected to head California's convention delegation as a favorite-son candidate, in order "to have a free and open delegation" if Eisenhower does not run. Knowland later indicated that he also would seek the backing of California's delegates. Nixon, therefore, cannot count upon the support of his own state for the nomination or, if nominated, upon all-out support from the state Republican organization.

A more serious objection that might be raised to nomination of Nixon is that the campaign tactics he has used to exploit the issue of Communists in government may have alienated masses of independent voters whose support is needed to elect a Republican President. Although Nixon's relative youth has been cited as a point against his nomination, he will be 44 years old at the time of the next inauguration—nine years beyond the minimum age for the presidency specified by the Constitution and more than a year older than Theodore Roosevelt at the time he became President.⁶

⁴ The poll, reported Nov. 5, showed Nixon to be the preferred candidate of 34 per cent of the Republican respondents, Warren of 23 per cent, Dewey of 10 per cent, Stassen of 9 per cent, Dulles of 8 per cent; others combined, 11 per cent; undecided, 5 per cent.

⁵ California went Republican in 1952 for the first time since 1928. The state now ranks almost at the top in number of electoral votes. The first ten states in order of number of electoral votes are New York (45), California (32), Pennsylvania (32), Illinois (27), Ohio (25), Texas (24), Michigan (20), Massachusetts (16), New Jersey (16), North Carolina (14).

⁶ If Dewey had been elected when he first ran in 1944, he would have been three weeks younger at inauguration than T.R. was when he succeeded McKinley.

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

Whether Nixon has the maturity of judgment needed to head the nation, which some persons have questioned, is a matter of opinion.

NIXON'S VOTES IN CONGRESS; USE OF ANTI-RED ISSUE

Richard Milhous Nixon, native Californian, comes from Whittier, a few miles southeast of Los Angeles. After graduating from Whittier College in 1934, Nixon took a law degree at Duke University, practiced law in his home town from 1937 to 1942, and subsequently put in seven or eight months as an attorney in the Washington headquarters of the Office of Price Administration. He then served as a naval officer, first in the South Pacific and later in Washington, until January 1946.

Reportedly backed by a group of California businessmen, Nixon went into politics the following autumn to contest the House seat held for ten years by Rep. Jerry Voorhis (D.). The Republican mid-term sweep of 1946 facilitated Nixon's election to the 80th Congress, but he won re-election easily in 1948 when California was going for Truman and the Democrats recaptured control of House and Senate. Nixon followed up his second House victory by successfully battling Rep. Helen Gahagan Douglas in 1950 for the Senate seat vacated by Sheridan Downey (D.). Two years later he was elected Vice President and returned from the stump to preside over the body of which he had so recently become a freshman member.

Nixon's voting record during his four years in the House and two years in the Senate reflected a conservative viewpoint on domestic questions. He voted to override President Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill, favored exemption of natural gas producers from federal price regulation, voted twice to relinquish federal claims to offshore oil deposits, and consistently opposed public housing. On the other hand, Nixon supported the Truman administration's plans for aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947 and subsequently voted for the Marshall Plan and other projects for foreign economic aid.

Both in Congress and in his campaigns for office, Nixon laid heavy emphasis on the Communist issue. Assigned to the Un-American Activities Committee at the beginning of his service in the House, he played a prominent part in the committee's exposure of Alger Hiss. With Rep. (now Sen.)

Editorial Research Reports

Mundt (R-S. D.), he was co-author of a Communist control bill which passed the House in 1948 and was the legislative forerunner of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

Nixon, while campaigning, repeatedly sought to link his political opponents to Communist views or to picture them as easy dupes of the Reds. After he became Vice President, he delivered numerous speeches along the same lines. His suggestion, at a news conference in April 1954, that the United States might have to send troops to fight the Communists in Indo-China brought a sharp reaction from persons who considered it a reckless extension of campaign tactics into the realm of high policy.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN: POPULAR BUT NOT RECEPTIVE

Next to Eisenhower, the man many Republicans would most like to see lead their party in the 1956 campaign is Chief Justice Earl Warren. Public opinion polls indicate that Warren is the one Republican mentioned for the presidency who could enlist enough support from Democrats and independents to defeat any of the leading Democratic candidates.⁷ Warren, born in Los Angeles of Norwegian parents, demonstrated extraordinary vote-getting power in California, where he became the only three-term governor in the state's history. When first elected in 1942, the state had about twice as many registered Democrats as Republicans. Warren in 1946 won the nominations of both parties under California's cross-filing primary system, and in 1950 he was re-elected by a two-to-one margin over James Roosevelt.

The bipartisan support enjoyed by Warren attests to his moderate, middle-of-the-road views. Standing for social progress but not Socialism, he was, as governor, a vigorous proponent of health insurance, slum clearance, and other social legislation. His capacity as an executive was demonstrated by able administration of the affairs of a large and rapidly growing state through years of war and postwar adjustment. On the Supreme Court, to which President Eisenhower appointed him in September 1953, Warren has exerted a harmonizing influence that was notably displayed in the Court's handling of the delicate issue of school segregation.

⁷ Warren was pitted against Harriman and Stevenson, successively, in Gallup polls reported Oct. 15 and 18. In the first poll Warren received 59 per cent of the total vote and Harriman 37 per cent, with the remainder undecided; in the second poll the division was 52 per cent for Warren and 45 per cent for Stevenson. Gallup polls reported Nov. 17 and Nov. 22 showed Nixon trailing both Stevenson and Kefauver.

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

AGE AND CHURCH OF PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES

	Born	Age on Jan. 20 1957	Age on Jan. 20 1961	Church
REPUBLICANS				
Dwight D. Eisenhower	Oct. 14, 1890	66	70	Presbyterian
Thomas E. Dewey	Mar. 24, 1902	54	58	Episcopal
Milton S. Eisenhower	Sept. 15, 1899	57	61	Episcopal
Christian A. Herter	Mar. 28, 1895	61	65	Episcopal
William F. Knowland	June 26, 1908	48	52	Methodist
Richard M. Nixon	Jan. 9, 1913	44	48	Quaker
Harold E. Stassen	Apr. 13, 1907	49	53	Baptist
Earl Warren	Mar. 19, 1891	65	69	Baptist
DEMOCRATS				
W. Averell Harriman	Nov. 15, 1891	65	69	Episcopal
Estes Kefauver	July 26, 1903	53	57	Baptist
Frank J. Lausche	Nov. 14, 1895	61	65	Catholic
Adlai E. Stevenson	Feb. 5, 1900	56	60	Presbyterian*

* Formerly Unitarian.

When Warren's appointment was announced, Eisenhower said he had chosen the California governor because he thought he would make "a great Chief Justice," also because he wanted "a man who was healthy, strong, who had not had any serious illnesses, and who was relatively young—if you can call a man of approximately my age relatively young." Because Warren is only five months younger than the President, age might be thought to disqualify him for the White House.

More to the point is the fact that the Chief Justice, in full respect for tradition and public policy, has gone out of his way to discourage consideration of his name. On Apr. 15, 1955, two days after a Gallup poll had shown him in the lead for the Republican nomination if Eisenhower did not seek a second term, Warren issued the following public statement:

My name has been used as a possible candidate for the presidency. This has been a matter of embarrassment to me because it reflects upon the performance of my duties as Chief Justice of the United States.

When I accepted that position, it was with the fixed purpose of leaving politics permanently for service on the Court. That is still my purpose. It is irrevocable. I will not change it under any circumstances or conditions.

Be they many or few, the remaining useful years of my life are dedicated to the service of the Supreme Court of the United States, in which work I am increasingly happy.

Warren thus publicly subscribed to the principle that members of the Supreme Court should steer completely clear of politics. In nearly a century only Charles Evans Hughes

Editorial Research Reports

had departed from that principle, and his decision to accept the Republican presidential nomination in 1916 was in contradiction to his own previously expressed views and apparently was taken with great reluctance.⁸ The continuing tradition of Supreme Court aloofness from politics never has prevented speculation as to the availability of one justice or another for a presidential nomination, but that is as far as it has gone. It is believed that Warren could be persuaded to change his mind, if at all, only by a personal appeal of the most urgent sort by President Eisenhower, and it would first be necessary to persuade the President to make such an appeal.

DEWEY AND STASSEN AS POSSIBILITIES IN A DEADLOCK

Two other possible Republican candidates, closely identified with the Eisenhower wing of the party, are Thomas E. Dewey and Harold E. Stassen. Both are eligible from the standpoint of age—Dewey is 53 and Stassen 48—but both may be politically handicapped by the fact that they have failed in previous efforts to attain the presidency.

Dewey's defeat by Roosevelt in 1944, in the midst of the war, was not held against him at the convention four years later, but when, with Warren as running-mate, he lost an election that everyone thought was in the bag, it was a bitter blow to his fellow-Republicans. Stassen never has been the party's standard-bearer, but strenuous efforts on his part to win the nomination were less effective in 1952 than in 1948. If either man comes to the fore in next year's convention, it is likely to be as a compromise candidate, brought forward to break a deadlock.

Reiterating that he would not make another White House bid, Dewey said on Dec. 28, 1949: "My statement applies to 1952, '56 and '60—if I live that long." Dewey put his strong influence to work for Eisenhower's nomination and, after the 1952 election, told the President-elect that he would not accept a federal appointment. When his third four-year term as governor ended last Jan. 1, he entered the private practice of law and presumably left all politics behind.

Dewey's name nevertheless keeps bobbing up in current speculation on a nominee to replace Eisenhower. The talk usually stops with the suggestion that the former governor

⁸ See "Judges in Politics," *E.R.R.*, Vol. I 1952, pp. 67-71. Warren is said to fear that his participation in the 1956 campaign would stir up violent political controversy over the whole issue of racial segregation.

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

may exert decisive influence on choice of the nominee. Sometimes it goes on to suggest that Dewey himself will be asked and will consent to head the ticket once more.⁹

Stassen was elected governor of Minnesota in 1938 at the age of 31. Achieving prominence as the youngest state executive in the country, he was selected as keynoter of the 1940 Republican convention and served also as floor manager for Wendell Willkie. Not long after starting his third two-year term as governor in 1943, Stassen resigned to join the Navy and served two years in the South Pacific on Adm. Halsey's staff. He came home shortly before the end of the war to accept appointment as a member of the U.S. delegation at the founding conference of the United Nations at San Francisco.

As early as Dec. 17, 1946, Stassen announced his candidacy for the Republican presidential nomination of 1948. He campaigned that year in presidential primaries all over the country and collected a substantial number of pledged delegates. Dewey's delegate total was considerably larger, however, and in the convention Stassen trailed Taft as well as Dewey. The Minnesotan became president of the University of Pennsylvania in the summer of 1948 but continued to make frequent speeches on public issues. On Dec. 27, 1951, he again announced his candidacy for the White House. In another extensive primary campaign Stassen fared badly in most states, but his control of the Minnesota delegation at the convention enabled him to engineer the switch of 19 votes that gave Eisenhower the nomination on the first ballot.

Stassen resigned his university presidency to succeed Averell Harriman as director of the Mutual Security Agency (later Foreign Operations Administration) at the advent of the Eisenhower administration. Occupancy of that post carried membership in the National Security Council and made Stassen a key member of the Eisenhower "team." Last Mar. 19 he was appointed special assistant to the President on disarmament matters and has devoted his entire attention to that field since July 1, when F.O.A. became the International Cooperation Administration and was transferred to the State Department. A fortnight after Eisenhower was

⁹ Dewey is the only Republican given a second presidential nomination after failing on the first try. The Democrats nominated and elected Cleveland in 1893, although four years earlier he had lost his bid for a second successive White House term; William J. Bryan was the unsuccessful Democratic nominee in 1896, 1900 and 1908.

Editorial Research Reports

taken ill, Stassen agreed that he would be willing to accept the Republican nomination in 1956 if the President wanted him to do so, but on Oct. 16 he said he did not consider himself a candidate.

SENATOR KNOWLAND OF REPUBLICAN PARTY'S RIGHT WING

Sen. Knowland has come closer than any other potential Republican candidate to announcing that he will seek his party's nomination next year if the President bows out. In that case, the senator indicated in an interview Oct. 31, he would enter the primaries in his home state of California and in a number of eastern and mid-western states. The California primary does not take place until June 5—last primary date in 1956—but nomination papers for pledged delegates must be circulated between Mar. 7 and Apr. 6. Knowland's entry into the primary might alter Gov. Knight's favorite-son plans. It might also portend a bitter Nixon-Knowland primary battle with decisive effects on subsequent action of the national convention.

Knowland, born across the bay from San Francisco on June 26, 1908, entered politics at the age of 25. Elected to the lower house of the California legislature in 1933, he served there and in the state senate for six years. He was appointed Republican national committeeman for California in 1938 and in 1941, when only 33 years old, was made chairman of the National Committee's executive committee. After three years of service with the Army in the European theater, Knowland in August 1945 was appointed by Gov. Warren to fill the vacancy in Washington left by the death of Sen. Hiram W. Johnson. Knowland was elected to a full term in 1946, and in 1952 he won both Republican and Democratic nominations and was re-elected by the largest vote ever polled by a candidate in California.

In the Senate Knowland became identified with the Taft forces of the right and was picked by the late senator to succeed him in 1953 as Republican floor leader. The new leader was less isolationist than a number of other right-wing senators and his record on domestic questions was less conservative than that of Nixon. Knowland, for example, had shown a more friendly attitude to public housing and, unlike Nixon, had favored federal regulation of natural gas prices at the source. Recently he has strongly backed Agriculture Secretary Benson and the administration's flexible farm-price support system. He went off the Eisenhower

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

reservation, however, to vote last year for the Bricker amendment to revise the treaty power.

Knowland has given more consistent support to foreign military and economic aid than some of his right-wing confreres. He has broken with the Eisenhower administration principally on questions of Far Eastern policy. An outspoken foe of the Chinese Reds, he was prepared early this year to commit U. S. military forces to defense of the off-shore Quemoy and Matsu islands as well as Formosa. In July 1954 he threatened, if Communist China was seated in the United Nations, to resign his post of Senate leader to campaign for withdrawal of the United States from the world organization. Differences between Knowland and the White House on the approach to such foreign policy problems, though sometimes acute, never have produced an open political break.

VARIETY OF FAVORITE-SON OR DARK-HORSE POSSIBILITIES

Speculation on possible candidates for the Republican nomination, in addition to the leaders already discussed, has ranged far and wide. Persons suggested include, from fields outside of politics, Eisenhower's younger brother, Milton, president of Pennsylvania State University; Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, N.A.T.O. commander; and Paul G. Hoffman, first Marshall Plan administrator, first president of the Ford Foundation, now board chairman of the Fund for the Republic and of the Studebaker-Packard Corporation. Cabinet members and other Eisenhower appointees mentioned include Secretary of State Dulles, Treasury Secretary Humphrey, Labor Secretary Mitchell, Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., head of the U. S. delegation to the United Nations.

On the list of possible favorite-son or dark-horse candidates are various Republican senators, including right-wingers Bricker of Ohio and Dirksen of Illinois and liberals Case of New Jersey and Ives of New York; Rep. Charles A. Halleck of Indiana, member of the House since 1935 and Republican floor leader in the 80th and 83rd Congresses; and almost every Republican governor in the country. Among the governors, most prominence so far has been given to the names of George N. Craig of Indiana, Fred Hall of Kansas, Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts, Goodwin J. Knight of California, Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin of Maryland, and William G. Stratton of Illinois.

Editorial Research Reports

Many of the foregoing individuals have political handicaps of one kind or another, but the nomination of Willkie—a former Democrat and corporation executive whose prospects looked exceedingly slim up to within a few weeks of the 1940 Republican meeting—demonstrated that almost anything can happen in a deadlocked or truly open convention. Before the 1956 convention, however, some of the men now regarded as presidential possibilities may have been winnowed out in the primaries. Lacking an Eisenhower candidacy or the expression of an Eisenhower preference, the presidential primaries next year may have more than usual significance on the Republican side, if not also on the Democratic side.

Candidates for Democratic Nomination

THE CONTEST for next year's Democratic nomination is limited at present to three veterans of the 1952 pre-convention maneuvering—Stevenson, Harriman, and Kefauver. Stevenson, reluctant last time to put himself forward as a candidate, seemed until early autumn of this year to be the only prominent Democrat willing to enter the race in 1956. He apparently considered acceptance of renomination an honor and seriously entertained hope of beating Eisenhower in a second trial of strength.

It was only when it appeared probable that the Democratic standard-bearer would be running against a less formidable opponent that interest in the nomination quickened among other party leaders. Harriman insisted at first that he was for Stevenson, later that he was not an active candidate. But when the Democratic National Committee staged a big fund-raising dinner in Chicago on Nov. 19, Harriman attended in virtually the guise of a candidate, and he went on to the Pacific Northwest to make a series of political speeches. Kefauver, who has promised to announce late in December or early in January whether or not he will seek the nomination again,¹⁰ shared the spotlight with Harriman and with Stevenson at the Chicago rally. Meanwhile, southern Democratic leaders, never enthusiastic about the aforementioned trio, had begun casting about for means of con-

¹⁰ Though withholding final announcement, Kefauver said on Nov. 23 that he was "inclined to make the race."

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

trolling the convention and putting across an individual more to their liking.¹¹

With rivalry for the nomination developing, lively primary battles are in prospect in the Democratic as well as the Republican party. Presidential primaries often have little influence on final convention action; in 1952 Kefauver entered 16 primaries, won in 14, and had more pledged delegates than any other candidate, whereas Stevenson, the convention victor, entered no primaries at all. But presidential primaries may have decisive negative, if not positive, effects. Willkie's failure to win a single delegate in the Wisconsin primary in April 1944, after a spirited contest with Dewey, convinced him that he had no chance to capture the Republican nomination a second time, and he withdrew from the race forthwith.

Although a similar fate conceivably might befall Stevenson, he has decided to test his strength in a number of the presidential primaries. An invitation to enter the Minnesota primary on Mar. 20 has been accepted; other primaries in which it is thought Stevenson may compete are the contests in Pennsylvania on Apr. 24, in Florida on May 29, and in California on June 5. Kefauver won the 1952 primaries in California and Pennsylvania; he was not entered in Minnesota but received a substantial write-in vote there; in Florida he lost the preference vote to Sen. Richard B. Russell of Georgia but won five of the state's 24 convention votes.¹² Kefauver's impressive 1952 primary record may be expected to influence him to try to build up strength once more by that route. Harriman said on Oct. 22 that he would not go into any primary campaigns next year and would ask to have his name withdrawn if it should be proposed.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF STEVENSON'S NEW CANDIDACY

Adlai Stevenson, who made his candidacy for renomination official on Nov. 15, won in the 1952 election only the 89 electoral votes of seven states of the Solid South and two border states, as against Eisenhower's 442 electoral votes. The defeat, though complete, was not in all respects so smashing as it seemed. Stevenson polled more popular

¹¹ The Democratic national convention is to open at Chicago on Aug. 13, one week before the Republican convention begins at San Francisco. The last time the Democrats met first was in 1888, when they renominated President Cleveland.

¹² There will be 1,372 votes in the 1956 Democratic convention as against 1,230 in 1952. The number of delegates is being increased from 1,576 to 2,744 (each with half a vote), and the number of alternates from 1,576 to 1,896.

Editorial Research Reports

votes (27,315,000) than any other presidential contestant in the country's history except Eisenhower in the same election (33,779,000) and F. D. Roosevelt in the 1936 Democratic landslide (27,477,000). The ability of a relatively unknown candidate, running against a national hero, to mobilize such extensive popular support gave the Stevenson forces good reason to try again.

Public opinion polls indicate that Stevenson, now 55 years old, has retained a commanding lead among the rank and file of his own party. The American Institute of Public Opinion on Nov. 8 reported a preference for him as the 1956 nominee on the part of 48 per cent of the Democrats queried—far ahead of Kefauver, favored by 11 per cent, and of Harriman, favored by 10 per cent. Stevenson attracted the attention of professional politicians when he climaxed his initial campaign for elective office, in 1948, by capturing the Illinois governorship by a record plurality. It is in the years since the 1952 defeat, however, that he has become solidly entrenched in the esteem of party professionals. He did so by taking it upon himself to help liquidate the \$800,000 debt incurred in the effort to elect him.

Stevenson . . . pledged his services and time for a full year to lift the mortgage. Month after month, he barnstormed the country, rousing the party faithful at \$100-a-plate dinners, backing the local candidates. . . . He spoke not only in the great centers . . . but wherever the party craved help . . .

In traveling around the country raising money for the party, showing concern for politicians' problems, talking with them at leisure as he had been unable to do in the fury of the 1952 campaign, Stevenson found . . . that he had a corps of zealous men who were, in embryo, his machine if he wanted them.¹⁸

Stevenson supposedly was the candidate personally favored by President Truman for the 1952 nomination. Truman gave vigorous support in the campaign—so vigorous sometimes, it was believed, as to embarrass the nominee. After conferring with Stevenson in Chicago last Oct. 29, the former President said he would support him again next year if he were the Democratic nominee, but he insisted that he had "no candidates for President or Vice President until the convention acts." Suspicion that Truman's attitude toward Stevenson was cooling had been aroused earlier in the month. While a guest of the New York governor at Albany, Oct. 8, he had told reporters that Harriman had "all the qualifications for the presidency." At the same time,

¹⁸ Theodore H. White, "The Democrats: They're Off and Running for '56," *Collier's*, Oct. 28, 1955, p. 27.

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

however, Truman denied that he had promised to help Harri-
man get the nomination or had altered his feelings about
Stevenson.

STEVENSON'S POSITION ON IMPORTANT CURRENT ISSUES

Having served in executive rather than legislative govern-
ment posts,¹⁴ Stevenson has no voting record, but frequent
speeches since 1952 have publicized his views on leading
questions of the day. Although the issues that will take
precedence in the 1956 campaign cannot be written down
with certainty this far in advance, it seems safe to say that
there will be debate next autumn on the farm problem, on
various angles of the relationship between government and
business, on security risks and civil liberties, and on the
conduct of foreign affairs.

Stevenson clarified his position on the problem of declin-
ing farm income in a telegram on Oct. 21 to Democratic
leaders in a dozen mid-western states. Taking issue with
the Eisenhower administration's adherence to the current
system of flexible price supports for basic crops, Stevenson
came out for immediate return to rigid supports at 90 per
cent of parity. He said, however, that rigid price supports
were not a complete farm program and that "We must face
the realities of surpluses and unbalanced production." Other
measures advocated by the Illinois candidate to give agricul-
ture "equality with other parts of our economy" included
direct production payments for perishable commodities and
a land-rental program to promote soil conservation.

Stevenson said in a recent magazine article that no one
should object to "businessmen in government," so long as
that meant introducing into government efficient business
practices and "adding to government councils an intimate
understanding of industry and commerce." But the case
would be different "wherever a businessman brings with
him to government any ideas other than a completely objec-
tive and independent concept of the public good." While
stressing the "interdependence of government and business,"
Stevenson asserted that "To call the T.V.A. 'Communism'
or rural electrification 'Socialism' . . . is a kind of nonsense
that insults the facts and serves only evil."¹⁵

¹⁴ Stevenson acted as special counsel to the Agricultural Adjustment Admin-
istration, 1933-34, and as special assistant to Secretary of the Navy Knox, 1941-44;
headed an economic mission to Italy in 1943; served as special assistant to
Secretary of State Stettinius and Secretary of State Byrnes in 1945; was an
alternate U.S. delegate to the U.N. General Assembly, 1946 and 1947.

¹⁵ Adlai E. Stevenson, "My Faith in Democratic Capitalism," *Fortune*, October
1955, p. 126.

Editorial Research Reports

In a televised speech at the Chicago fund-raising dinner, Nov. 19, the candidate pointed to "what can only be described as special interest government in Washington." He insisted there was "no conflict between the Democratic party and business" and added: "What we criticize is not business, but the virtual exclusion [from the present administration] of everyone else." Stevenson deplored also "a determined attempt to undermine conservation and power programs" and pledged a continuing fight "to preserve the nation's heritage of natural resources." He had declared at Duluth on Oct. 29 that "A slick slogan about 'partnership' is no longer going to disguise a grand giveaway of America's power resources."

The former Illinois governor has assailed the Republicans for playing the "numbers game" on security risks in government and has warned against careless questioning of the patriotism of individuals or groups. At Miami Beach, Mar. 6, 1954, he called for eternal vigilance against subversion but declared that "Democracy's ideals and vitality must not be despoiled by those who purport to defend them." He came out last May for federal aid to promote further development of private health insurance plans and to accelerate medical research and medical school construction; in June he advocated \$800 million of federal aid annually for public education.

In a nation-wide broadcast last Apr. 11 Stevenson criticized an administration Far Eastern policy that threatened to involve the United States in hostilities over the Quemoy and Matsu islands in the Formosa Strait. At the same time he urged that the nations of the free world join in a mutual pledge to defend Formosa itself. He observed in the Nov. 19 speech at Chicago that "Peace and security cannot be had for the asking, or by slogans and tough talk, or by blowing alternately hot and cold, rash and prudent." He cautioned that "We and our allies must be strong to check Communist ambition," but added that creation of a "workable system of controlled disarmament" must be sought with "tireless patience." He called also for "a refreshed concern for our less fortunate neighbors" abroad.

POLITICAL VIEWS AND NEW DEAL SERVICE OF HARRIMAN

Harriman has not shown quite as much strength as Kefauver in public opinion polls, but his position as governor of the state with the largest Democratic convention

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

vote (94 in 1952) and the largest electoral vote (45) enhances his political attractiveness. In addition, Harriman demonstrated vote-getting ability a year ago in his first bid for elective office. Although he won the New York governorship by only a very narrow margin, he was the first Democrat to succeed in that effort since Lehman in 1938.

William Averell Harriman, son of the railroad magnate, Edward H. Harriman, was born on Nov. 15, 1891. Today, at 64, he is only a year younger than President Eisenhower and, if elected President, would be 65 at inauguration and entering his 70th year at the end of a first term. Formerly prominent as a polo player, a man of great wealth and wide business interests, Harriman has devoted himself increasingly to government service in the past two decades. He occupied various administrative posts in the National Recovery Administration of early New Deal days, was chairman of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce for three years, and served in the Office of Production Management at the beginning of the war mobilization.

President Roosevelt sent Harriman to England and Russia as his special representative on various missions in 1941 and 1942. He was in Moscow as U. S. ambassador from 1943 until a year after the Yalta conference, which he attended. Shifted to London as ambassador in April 1946, he was brought home by President Truman six months later to take Henry Wallace's place as Secretary of Commerce.¹⁶ With initiation of the Marshall Plan in the spring of 1948, Harriman became roving ambassador to the participating countries. Two years later he was appointed special White House adviser on foreign policy. The final federal post was that of director of the Mutual Security Agency, which Harriman held from its creation late in 1951 to the end of the Truman administration in January 1953.

The New York governor's present political views reflect his long New Deal-Fair Deal service rather than his business and social background. He asserted last Aug. 29 that the Eisenhower administration was dominated by "big corporations and special interests" and apparently was blind to farm problems. At Des Moines, Oct. 22, Harriman came out for 90 per cent farm price supports and for extension

¹⁶ Although not active in business since 1940, it was not until October 1946, when he became Commerce Secretary, that Harriman resigned as board chairman of the Union Pacific R.R. and restricted his interest in Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co., private banking firm, to that of a limited partner.

Editorial Research Reports

of the soil conservation program to take acreage temporarily out of production. On his recent tour of the Northwest he denounced the administration's power policy as involving a "phony partnership" amounting to "domination of government by big business"; he maintained that the result would be to strangle development of the West and to give away its natural resources. In other speeches Harriman advocated federal aid for education, an improved school lunch program, and revival for needy families of the food stamp plan of depression days.

In obvious retort to Stevenson's observation, at the Chicago rally, that "moderation is the spirit of the times," Harriman told the press the next day that "There is no such word as 'moderation' or 'middle-of-the-road' in the Democratic vocabulary." In keeping with that comment he made a slashing attack on Republican foreign policy, Nov. 21, in Seattle. He described the record as "three years of incompetence and short-sightedness." In Harriman's view the summit conference at Geneva was "a great Communist victory" that threw the free peoples off balance. To repair the damage, he called for "a great effort to build up again world confidence in our good will, our judgment, and our steadfastness of purpose." American armed strength, he said, must be made adequate and "We must work with the free world to build an expanding world economy."

In a commencement address at Syracuse University last June, Harriman suggested that "a galloping technology and a mounting population" would necessitate more extensive planning and control of the domestic economy than had been introduced under the New Deal and Fair Deal. At Buffalo, Nov. 14, he called for a "constant war on poverty" and advocated regularization of employment backed by an expanded program of social insurance.

Harriman made only a rather half-hearted campaign for the presidential nomination in 1952. At the convention he stood in fourth place—well behind Sen. Russell as well as Kefauver and Stevenson—on both the first and second ballots and then withdrew in favor of Stevenson.¹⁷ Today he obviously is prepared to work more strenuously to win the prize, and he has the support of Tammany Hall's shrewd leader, Carmine DeSapio, whose backing may be in part an

¹⁷ Harriman received 123½ votes on the first ballot and 121 on the second; 83½ of New York's 94 votes were cast for him on the first ballot, 84½ on the second, with a scattering of votes from a number of other states.

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

asset and in part a handicap. Harriman is said to be staying out of the primaries in the hope that Kefauver will topple Stevenson there.

SENATOR KEFAUVER: PRIMARY VOTE-GETTER AND LIBERAL

The televised Senate crime investigation that put Estes Kefauver of Tennessee in popular favor across the country in 1950 simultaneously made him disliked by big-city party bosses; the probe turned up evidence pointing to political corruption and was blamed for some of the Republican gains in the congressional elections that autumn. When Kefauver sought the presidential nomination two years later, he had no encouragement from the White House—whether because of political repercussions from the underworld inquiry or because he outstripped President Truman in the first (New Hampshire) primary.¹⁸

Kefauver's vigorous hand-shaking campaign in the primaries brought him into the 1952 convention as the leading candidate. He polled 340 votes on the first ballot, to Stevenson's 273, and on the second ballot increased the total to 362½ votes. The Stevenson bandwagon then began to roll, and the Illinois governor was nominated on the third ballot. Kefauver was left to nurse his disappointment and figure out how to liquidate a substantial personal debt. Still only 52 years old, he now seems eager to try his hand at staging a repeat performance in the 1956 primaries, despite the fact that financing is again a problem and despite some hesitancy about once more taking the risk of losing the prize after a great expenditure of time, energy, and money.

Elected to the House in 1938, Kefauver served five terms there before moving up to the Senate a decade later. He has had a consistently liberal voting record. In the upper house he has opposed the present system of flexible farm-price supports, relinquishment of federal claims to offshore oil, exemption of natural gas prices from federal regulation at the source, reductions in foreign military or economic aid, and the changes in the treaty power proposed by the Bricker amendment; favored public housing, additional funds for T.V.A., 18-year-old voting, and a \$100 increase in personal tax exemptions.

¹⁸ When Truman's name was entered in New Hampshire without his consent, he first said he would withdraw but then decided to let the candidacy stand. Kefauver, polling 29,000 to Truman's 16,000 votes in the preference primary, won all of the state's eight convention votes.

Editorial Research Reports

At the end of October Kefauver came out for restoration of 90 per cent farm price supports but indicated that in the long run he would favor a subsidy system carrying greater benefits for small farmers than for large farmers. More recently he has advocated revival of the food stamp plan to help reduce crop surpluses. In a speech at Atlantic City in mid-October the Tennessean discussed continuing dangers of business monopoly and cited the Dixon-Yates contract as "a fine example of devious dealing by the monopolistic interests in controlling the government to throttle competition." Kefauver adheres strongly to the view, put forward by Roosevelt in support of T.V.A. 20 years ago, that public power projects are indispensable as yardsticks for private power. At Muskegon, Mich., Oct. 29, he echoed a Truman slogan by declaring that "We Democrats believe in a fair deal for agriculture, labor, and for business."

Following a trip behind the Iron Curtain, Kefauver said on Oct. 20 that increased trade with the Soviet Union would benefit this country more than Russia. In the *Nashville Tennessean* two days later he wrote that the Kremlin's "smiling new face" had caught the West unprepared and raised "far more perplexing problems than did the actual cold war." He added: "Despite the dramatic gestures of our government at Geneva, developments since Geneva [the summit conference] clearly demonstrate that the Soviet Union retains the initiative it assumed before the close of World War II."

LATENT SOUTHERN SUPPORT FOR A DARK-HORSE CANDIDATE

The long persisting cleavage between the liberal northern wing and the conservative southern wing of the Democratic party tended to pass out of sight after 1952, when the newly assumed role of political opposition made it easier for Democrats of all kinds to work together. Even when the party's control of Congress was restored by the mid-term elections, the moderate leadership of Speaker Rayburn in the House and of Sen. Johnson in the upper chamber helped to keep the party united. In the meantime, two particularly divisive issues—offshore oil and racial segregation—were being removed from the national political arena, the one by Eisenhower-backed legislation and the other by Supreme Court decisions.

Stevenson's stand on the two issues made southerners reluctant to vote for him in 1952, but now he seems con-

Presidential Possibilities, 1956

siderably more acceptable to them than either Harriman or Kefauver—both too closely identified with New Dealism to be other than suspect to southern conservatives. However, despite trying, Stevenson has not yet won all southern Democrats to his side. The lingering opposition appeared to be responsible for a recently reported plan, attributed to Sen. Johnson, to keep the convention open, and possibly give the South a veto over the nomination, by making Johnson the favorite-son candidate of Texas and handing him control of a sizable bloc of southern votes.

When the southern governors held their annual conference in mid-October, they gave little encouragement to that plan.¹⁹ But within a fortnight Sen. Russell of Georgia, forswearing any presidential ambitions in 1956, called for a middle-of-the-road candidate and platform and put Gov. Frank J. Lausche of Ohio forward as a man who might emerge as a formidable dark-horse candidate. Lausche, expected to be Ohio's favorite son at the Democratic convention, has shown phenomenal vote-winning capacities. He was elected governor in 1944 and, though defeated in 1946, has been re-elected every two years since 1948—five times in all.

The fact that 60-year-old Lausche is a Catholic married to a non-Catholic has not proved in Ohio to be the double political handicap that might have been feared,²⁰ while Russell's mention of Lausche indicates that it would not be the stumbling block in the South today that Al Smith's Catholicism was in 1928. Lausche has been named as an acceptable "moderate" also by Gov. Shivers of Texas, who is bitterly opposed to Stevenson and unenthusiastic about either Harriman or Kefauver.

Among other Democrats suggested as possible dark-horse or compromise candidates are former Air Force Secretary W. Stuart Symington of Missouri, Sens. Albert Gore of Tennessee and Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, and Govs. Frank G. Clement of Tennessee, George M. Leader of Pennsylvania, Robert B. Meyner of New Jersey, and G. Mennen Williams of Michigan. Most of the men on the list look more like vice presidential than presidential possibilities, but there is no telling whom the lightning will strike in a deadlocked convention.

¹⁹ Gov. Clement of Tennessee, strong supporter of Stevenson, was elected chairman of the Southern Governors Conference for the coming year.

²⁰ Lausche's biggest victory was over Charles P. Taft, prominent Protestant layman, in 1952, year of the Eisenhower landslide.

